

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

RECEIVED CLERK'S OFFICE

Bernard Bagley, # 175851 )  
Petitioner, )  
vs. )  
State of South Carolina; Brian T. Petrano, )  
Assistant Attorney General; Cecilia )  
Reynolds, Warden, )  
Respondents. )  
\_\_\_\_\_  
)

2010 JUL 22 A 10:31

Civil Action No. 2:10-1557-TLW-RSC

DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON, SC

## ORDER

Bernard Bagley, (“petitioner”), brought this civil action *pro se* pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 2241 on June 17, 2010. (Doc. # 1). This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Robert S. Carr, to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court dismiss the petition without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. (Doc. # 8). Objections were due by July 12, 2010. Petitioner has filed no objections to the Report. However, on July 6, 2010, Petitioner filed a letter stating that he agrees to the dismissal, but wants the order to “include or amend to state that Petitioner is allowed change of venue in the interest of justice from the Charleston Division to any other division within South Carolina in future filing(s).” (Doc. # 10).

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept,

reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 8). Therefore, the case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. With regards to the Petitioner's letter, this court denies the request to allow Petitioner a change of venue. (Doc. # 10).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

July 21, 2010, 2010  
Florence, South Carolina